

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated March 28, 2007. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any fees which are due in connection with this response.

The Office Action rejected:

- (a) Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 16-19, 21-26, 28-31, 33-37, 39-44, 46-51, 53-56, 58-63, 65-68 and 70-74 and 76-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,561,904 ("Locke");
- (b) Claims 7, 20, 32, 45, 57, 69, 88 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locke; and
- (c) Claims 13, 15, 27, 38, 52, 64 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locke in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0065126 to Miller et al. ("Miller").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections.

Locke discloses a gaming device having a bonus game in which a player receives a plurality of free spins. In each spin, a set of multipliers is available. Prior to a free spin, one of the multipliers is randomly selected. Col. 4, Lines 15-20. If the player receives an award from the outcome of the reels on a free spin, the award associated with the reel outcome is multiplied by the selected multiplier. Col. 4, Lines 35-40. The set of multipliers available can remain the same from free spin to free spin or can change. Col. 5, Line 60 – Col. 6, Line 13. Consequently, during the bonus game, a first outcome and a second outcome can be associated with a different set of multipliers. Col. 4, Lines 49-67.

The Office Action interprets a "current outcome" in the bonus game to be a first one of the first components and a "next outcome" to be a second one of the first components. Further, the Office Action interprets the "current outcome" as having a predetermined relationship ("the first relationship") with a current set of hourglasses (e.g., "1X, 1X, 2X, 2X, 3X, 5X, 3X, 2X, 2X, 1X, 1X") and associated multipliers and the "next outcome" as having a predetermined relationship ("the second relationship") with

the next set of hourglasses (e.g., "1X, 2X, 2X, 3X, 5X, 3X, 2X, 2X, 1X"). The Office Action further interprets the first relationship to exist simultaneously with the second relationship because at the time the current outcome is determined, it is predetermined that the "next outcome" will be associated with the next set of hourglasses.

Locke also discloses displaying the different sets of hourglasses and associated multipliers on different spins. The Office Action appears to state that because the elements of all of the subsequent sets of hourglasses are displayed when the current set of hourglasses is displayed, this means that all subsequent sets of hourglasses are displayed. The Office Action then concludes that because all subsequent sets of hourglasses are displayed during the current spin, the predetermined relationships "... for all sets of second components are displayed simultaneously." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As noted above, the Office Action has interpreted the "current outcome" and the "next outcome" as the first and second first components. It is respectfully submitted that the "current outcome" and the "next outcome" are not simultaneously displayed in Locke. As a result, the predetermined relationship between the "current outcome" and the first set of multipliers is not simultaneously displayed with the predetermined relationship between the "next outcome" and the second set of multipliers even if all sets of hourglasses are interpreted as being displayed when the "current outcome" is displayed.

Even if the "current outcome" and "next outcome" were interpreted as being simultaneously displayed when all sets of hourglasses are also interpreted as being displayed, it is respectfully submitted that the predetermined relationships are not being displayed. Merely displaying two items on a screen does not necessarily display a predetermined relationship between those two items. In particular, merely displaying the elements of a subsequent set of hourglasses indistinguishably from the current set of hourglasses as disclosed by Locke does not amount to displaying the relationship between the "next outcome" and a subsequent set of hourglasses. It is respectfully submitted that at most, the predetermined relationship between the "current outcome" and the current set of hourglasses is displayed.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Locke does not disclose a display device that simultaneously displays a predetermined relationship of a first one of the first components and a second one of the first components with different sets of second components.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Locke combined with Miller does not render obvious a display device that simultaneously displays a predetermined relationship of a first one of the first components and a second one of the first components with different sets of second components.

For at least these reasons, it is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and its dependent claims are each patentably distinguished over Locke and are in condition for allowance. For similar reasons, Claim 16, 28, 39, 53 and 65 and their respective dependent claims are each patentably distinguished over Locke and are in condition for allowance. For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 16, 28, 39, 53 and 65 and their respective dependent claims are each patentably distinguished over Locke in view of Miller and are in condition for allowance.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Locke does not disclose that there are two sets of hourglasses satisfying the condition that the first set has an element not present in the second set and the second set has an element not present in the first set. The Office Action interprets the set of "1X, 1X, 2X, 2X, 3X, 5X, 3X, 2X, 2X, 1X, 1X" as a first set and the set of "1X, 2X, 2X, 3X, 5X, 3X, 2X, 2X, 1X" as a second set. The Office Action also states that the first set includes two elements, specifically the right-most and left-most 1Xs, which are not members of any other set disclosed by Locke. Then, the Office Action concludes from the above that Locke discloses "... an embodiment wherein the second set of second components includes a second one of the second components which is not in the first set of second components."

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action is mistaken. The second set of "1X, 2X, 2X, 3X, 5X, 3X, 2X, 2X, 1X" only includes multipliers that were present in the first set. Further, Locke discloses that all subsequent sets are composed exclusively of multipliers that were already present in all of the previous sets.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that lock does not disclose that the first set of second components includes a first one of the second components which is not in the second set of second components and that the second set of second components includes a second one of the second components which is not in the first set of second components. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 88 is patentably distinguished over Locke and is in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action is similarly mistaken in its rejection of Claim 89. Even if the first set of "1X, 1X, 2X, 2X, 3X, 5X, 3X, 2X, 2X, 1X, 1X" includes two multipliers that are not present in any other set of multipliers, that does not mean that Locke discloses that one set of second components includes one second component that is not shared by any other set of second components and that another set of second components includes another second component that is not shared by any other set of second components. To the contrary, each subsequent set of multipliers disclosed by Locke is composed of multipliers that were present in the previous sets.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 89 is patentably distinguished over Locke and is in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC
BY



Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Cust. No. 29159

Dated: May 29, 2007